

Appln No. 10/625,834
Amdt date June 24, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 10, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office action of May 10, 2005 and the Examiner Interview of June 23, 2005, Applicant submits the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 47 are currently amended. No claims are currently added. Claims 1-56 remain pending.

On page 2 of the Office action, claims 48-56 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicant does not traverse this withdrawal and currently intends to file a continuation application for these claims.

On page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite as the Examiner states that the term "afloat" in Applicant's independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 is not broad enough to cover limitations in Applicant's dependent claims, such as "airborne/spaceborne." The Examiner is correct that the scope of the invention claimed in claims 1-37 is not intended to be limited only to a water environment. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 to recite that the tracking and command system is "floating," which is consistent with floating in/on air, space, or other media, as is within the spirit of the original claims and disclosure. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the indefiniteness rejection to claims 1-37 be withdrawn. If the Examiner believes a different genus would better cover this inventive aspect of the invention, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned telephonically to discuss any remaining issues.

Appln No. 10/625,834

Amdt date June 24, 2005

Reply to Office action of May 10, 2005

On page 3 of the Office action, claim 47 has been rejected as anticipated by either Ishida or Garibotto. Applicant has amended claim 47 to recite that the mobile tracking and command system is spaced from and coupled to the craft through a transceiver, and that craft commands are transmitted through the transceiver to the craft. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ishida nor Garibotto discloses a system that meets these limitations. In fact, both Ishida and Garibotto disclose mobile units (a car and a robot, respectively) that have tracking and command systems onboard, so that they are only mobile when they are inside the unit (or craft). Applicant's claim, however, recites a tracking and command system that is spaced from the craft, and which communicates the commands to the craft via a transceiver. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 47 is therefore not anticipated by either Garibotto or Ishida, nor a combination of the two references, and requests that the rejection to claim 47 be withdrawn.

Applicant notes that claims 48-56 are withdrawn from consideration, and currently plans to file these claims in a divisional application.

Applicant further notes with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 38-46 have been allowed. As Applicant now believes that all pending claims 1-47 are now in form for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow all claims and pass them to issuance. If the Examiner believes any issue currently remains as to the patentability of the pending claims, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the

Appln No. 10/625,834
Amdt date June 24, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 10, 2005

undersigned at the number listed before issuing an Advisory
Action.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Rose A. Hickman
Reg. No. 54,167
626/795-9900

RAH/eaj
EAJ PAS629879.1--*-06/24/05 2:32 PM